

## REMARKS

### I. IN THE OFFICE ACTION

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner states that there is no support in the application for the amended terminology “. . . a pressure containment production tubular.” Office Action, page 2 (emphasis in original).

Claims 1-4 and 10 stand rejected under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over European Patent Application Publication No. 145,266 in the name of Costain Streeter Lining Ltd. Office Action, page 3.

Claims 5-9 and 11 stand rejected under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over European Patent Application Publication No. 145,266 issued to Costain Streeter Lining Ltd. Office Action, page 3.

Claims 1-4 and 10 stand rejected under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,092,265 issued to Hughes et al. Office Action, page 3.

Claims 5-9 and 11 stand rejected under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,092,265 issued to Hughes et al. Office Action, page 3.

The Examiner notes that neither reference discloses or suggests applying a multi-component liquid liner composition to the inner surface of a pressure containment production tubular. Office Action, page 4.

## **II. DISCUSSION OF REJECTIONS**

Applicant appreciates the courtesy extended during the telephone conference with the Examiner on April 26, 2005, and Applicant files this Response in accordance with that telephone conference.

### **Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph**

Support for pressure containment production tubulars is found at page 2, lines 15–18 of the specification as originally filed. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the amended language “pressure containment production tubulars” satisfies the written description requirement. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-11 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

### **Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and § 103(a)**

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to recite “a pressure containment production tubular applicator.” As indicated by the Examiner in the final Office Action, neither reference, EP 145,266 nor Hughes et al. (“Hughes”), disclose or suggest application of a multi-component liquid liner to the inner surface of a *pressure containment production tubular*. See Office Action, page 4. The Examiner’s position is supported by the fact that EP 145,266 discloses a rotary spray device

disposed on one or more “sledges” to be “pulled” through non-pressurized manholes and sewer pipes. Abstract; p. 1, lns. 1-5; p. 3, lns. 18-21; p. 5, lns. 5-7; p. 6, lns. 1-4; p. 10, lns. 12-21. With respect to Hughes, this reference discloses an apparatus for applying a coating to the interior surface of a cavity of non-pressurized manhole or potable water conduits. Col. 1, lns. 24-50; Col. 2, lns. 59-61. The cavity is large enough to permit a person to be present in the cavity, however, the invention disclosed, taught, and suggested in Hughes permits the person to be absent from the cavity. Col. 2, lns. 40-56; Col. 3, lns. 19-24. Like EP 145,266, Hughes does not disclose, teach, or suggest pressure containment conduits or production tubulars. In fact, the teachings of Hughes are directed to “cavities” that permit a person to be physically present in the cavity. In other words, Hughes does not disclose, teach, or suggest any system for use in small pressurized conduits that do not permit physical access by a person.

Because neither EP 145,266 nor Hughes disclose or teach pressure containment production tubulars, the “pressure containment production tubular applicator” of the amended claims is likewise not disclosed or suggested in either Hughes or EP 145,266. Such an applicator is used in pressure containment production tubulars, such as oil and gas wells, so that the systems recited in claims 1-11 can effectively deliver and apply the multi-component liquid liner composition to the inner surface of the pressure containment production tubulars. And, therefore, neither EP 145,266 nor Hughes anticipate or render obvious amended claims 1-11. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1-11 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) or, alternatively, under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based upon EP 145,266 and Hughes be withdrawn.

**Cancellation of Withdrawn Claims**

As discussed in the telephone conference with the Examiner, to expedite the issuance of claims 1-11, presuming that the foregoing amendments and remarks are sufficient to overcome the Examiner's reasons for rejection in the final Office Action, the Examiner is authorized to cancel withdrawn claims 12-20 through an Examiner's Amendment at the time of issuance of the Notice of Allowance.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the amendment to claim 1 be entered and that the rejections of claims 1-11 be withdrawn. In order to expedite the examination of this application, Applicant requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned at (713) 220-4168 to discuss any matters that can be resolved by telephone.

Date: April 27, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony F. Matheny  
Reg. No. 43,778  
Customer No. 31248  
ANDREWS & KURTH L.L.P.  
600 Travis, Suite 4200  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(713) 220-4168

Attorney for Assignee